LETTERS OF AN EXILE, No. XX.

A TURKISH WEDDING.

Correspondence of The N. Y. Tribune.

ASIA MINOR, Dec. 15, 1851.

I have just returned from a Turkish wedding, and have found the ceremony strange enough to be related to you. I have remarked that the rites of the Mohammedan religion are little known by the Europeans, and I don't think the Americans better acquainted with them than we are. Except the ablutions five times a day, which constitute the principal part of a Mussulman's liturgy, we neither know nor condescend to inquire how the Crescent ministers behave themselves at the important period of the birth, the wedding, and the death of their followers. It is well to ask if nothing in their rites has the most distant analogy with ours, if the *myths* of the ancient Asiatic religions are not to be traced in them, or at least if the ritual part of the Mohammedan religion is as fantastic, capricious, childish, puerile, void of sense and of morality as its moral part.

Since my arrival in this country I have tried to gather some notions about the subject, but have met many difficulties. The ignorance of the many, the suspicions of some, and the natural taciturnity of the rest, have, till now, put a stop to the conversations I endeavored to establish upon these matters. But my eyes have seen more than my ears have heard, and I don't despair of getting some curious information about the ceremonies of the Mussulmans' church.

To come at once to the wedding; it was to take place between the son of a neighbor of mine and a young lady of the next town. She had, they said, objected very much to marrying with a countryman, leaving the town and its civilization and burying herself in this solitary valley; but on hearing that the Franks' village was close to her betrothed's property, she had gladly consented, which was very flattering for us. Thanks to my double quality of neighbor and of creditor of the family, I was invited to assist at the ceremony, and I declared my intention to remain to the last moment and see all that was to be seen.

The father, the sister, and some friends of both sexes of the bridegroom's family were gone the day before to town to fetch the young girl (twelve years old) and to escort her to her new abode. Strolling leisurely about my garden in the morning of the eventful day, I discovered the bridegroom dressed in his every-day garments and looking very doleful. I thought some misfortune had occurred to break off the match, and, calling Hassan, I asked him what ailed him. "Nothing," answered the lad, opening widely his large mouth with an intended smile, and winking at me with a knowing look; "nothing—but I am going to get married, and you know——" Again the winking and the smile, but I understood nothing. Happily, the mother joined us, and, understanding my question, she informed me it was the custom in such like circumstances for the bridegroom to keep himself afar from the whole company, and, if met by chance by some one, to look as serious, as sulky, and as shabby as possible. One laugh from him would be reckoned the greatest impropriety in the world—quite shocking!—and, what is still worse, perhaps, would lead to the most distressing consequences, as falling under the power of the Evil Eye, being charmed, or such things. During the explanation, I saw the boy made great exertions not to burst out in a hearty laugh, and, fearing to call upon his head all sorts of mischance, I hastily [illegible]ising to come back as soon as the bride made her appearance.

Late in the afternoon, some volleys of musketry announced the expected arrival. I stationed myself upon the narrow foot-path that, passing before my house, leads to my neighbor's, and before long saw the approaching procession. They were all mounted on horseback. First, the bridegroom's father appeared in his most splendid attire, followed by two ragged boys on foot who figured as pages. Then the male friends; then the sister of the bridegroom, a young woman recently married, well-looking and rather intelligent; then something which I could not name at first sight, but which I subsequently guessed—by its situation in the cortege and for the powerful reason that it could n't be anything else—to be the bride herself. What was visible of her was a counterpane, carefully wrapping up a sort of huge ball, as we are used to see a great many piled up upon the deck of a merchant ship. The female friends followed; then the music and dancers of the next village; then some men armed with old muskets and carabines, representing the National Guard; and lastly of all, the spectators, men and children, running, laughing and shouting quite as civilized people.

I, too, followed the cavalcade, and arrived at the bridal house just in time to see the young woman's reception. As she stopped her horse, (I rather suppose the horse stopped himself, but never mind,) a little boy of two years old was handed to her. She took hold of him, seated him before her upon the saddle, and taking out from the recesses of the counterpane an apple, gave it to the urchin, who, having completed his part, was carried away. It was now the turn of the counterpaned lady to dismount, and I thought the feat rather a remarkable one; but she managed it pretty well, and reached the ground without having greatly disturbed the symmetry of the counterpane's folds. Her future mother-in-law, with some more female friends and connections were standing at the door ready to welcome her, and as soon as she advanced a young boy displayed a carpet before her. Upon this carpet she knelt at her mother-in-law's feet, and remained one moment in a prostrate attitude, as if kissing the threshold of her new home, and acknowledging her filial duty toward her new mother. I had come with no feelings of compunction, and rather to assist at a ludicrous scene than at a solemn one. And yet the sight of that young girl, of a child entering a new life and prostrating herself upon the threshold of it, imploring pity and affection, moved me, and I hastened into the house, where I arrived just in time to see the mother-in-law raising her daughter in her arms and kissing her with tenderness. Then the young bride was confided to the matron's hands, the outside door was shut upon her, and she was taken into the inner apartments. There a new prostration ensued and a new embrace, but my heart was hardened against melting impulses, and I looked at the second representation, wondering why the first had made such an impression upon me. I expected to see the young girl disencumbered from her ample folds, but I was mistaken. Notwithstanding the burning temperature of the day, she stood wrapped in her manifold veils—her head, face, neck, and shoulders quite covered—sinking under the weight of her dresses, scarfs, ruffles, and jewels, in a corner of the room, sobbing and crying with all her might. The ladies dined, the ladies sung and danced, the ladies chattered and were very noisy. Not so the poor girl, who was silent, and did nothing but cry. She was the topic of the conversation; her age, her family, her fortune, all that concerned her—to the very kisses she had received that very day from her brothers as stimulus to her courage and fortitude—all was related, discussed, and repeated many times; but she seemed scarcely aware of what they said, and took no part whatever in the entertainment.

Hours succeeded to hours; the day passed and evening came, and with the evening the priest, or Imaum, and the ceremony began. The priest was seated upon a carpet spread upon the ground, outside the door of the house, between two of his acolytes. When the moment was come and all was ready, the priest changed the sitting posture for the kneeling, invoked the blessing of Allah, and replaced himself in his first attitude. The bridegroom then appeared, handing a young boy of some ten years old, who carried a sort of black paste upon a plate and handed it to the priest, who put the plate upon the carpet at his side, took a bit of the paste, which I learned afterward to be the *kenne*, and rolled it in his fingers till he made a ball of it murmuring all the while some sort of incantation. He then took the hand of the bridegroom, who, with his extraordinary mate, knelt before him, and shut it, as if he wished to show him how to box; but his intentions were of a much more pacific nature. Keeping the ball of paste on the top of his fore-finger, he introduced it into the hand of the young man, and leaving in it the greater part of the paste, he took out a little quantity, spread it upon the orifice of the hole formed by the bended fingers; and inclining the thumb upon it, he sealed the whole hand and seemed satisfied with the result. But fearing, I suppose, that some unlooked for circumstance should destroy this capital work, he rolled a handkerchief many times round the closed hand of the bridegroom, and did not leave till he had ascertained that to unloose it would not be the affair of an instant. The same operation was accomplished upon the head of the little boy; after which, they both rose up and were married, or at least one of them was married, not to the other, but to a poor girl, who had taken no part whatever in the ceremony. What was she doing during this time? Nothing but what she had done from the beginning of that memorable day—crying, and I really felt a great deal of compassion for the poor creature. Other people, however, were better occupied in the interior of the *balamut*. A young girl of twelve and a boy about the same age were preparing the couch for the new couple—kneeling, courtesying and singing at every new piece of furniture. Disposing the mattresses, they made one genuflection; placing the pillows, they prostrated themselves upon the floor; arranging the sheets and blankets, they crossed their arms upon their breasts, bowed their heads and sang all the while. The sight of their movements was rather pleasing.

At that period I retired, and nobody but the nearest relatives of the bridegroom remained. But next morning I went, as the etiquette required, to pay my compliments to the new couple, and found the face of the young bride radiant with smiles. I complimented the bridegroom upon the efficacy of his consoling endeavors, adding that I had never seen so many tears dried up in such a short time. "The girl was rather low, yesterday, in leaving her old home," answered the sister-in-law; "but as for tears, it don't signify; she ought to cry and she did her part well." And I vowed never, in the future, to give way to compassion for any crying young girl, without previously ascertaining it was not for etiquette and decorum's sake that she let [illegible] of her eyes.

CHRISTINE TRIVULZIO DI BELGIOIOSO.

WASHINGTON.

Rantoul on Free Trade—Fillmore and the Presidency.

Correspondence of The N. Y. Tribune.

WASHINGTON, Tuesday, Feb. 21, 1852.

Mr. ROBT. RANTOUL, in his late speech on a bill granting lands to the State of Missouri with which to endow certain Railroad corporations, came out flat-footed for British Free Trade. Mr. RANTOUL lives in a District which annually receives near *seventy thousand dollars* for fishing bounties. Will he have the kindness to favor us with his views upon this particular branch of the protective policy? It is one upon which we feel sure he would be entirely at home, and his expertness at figures would make his exposition particularly entertaining.

We find, on recurring to the last published account of the sums paid out for bounties, that the total amount paid in the year 1849 was $281,858 66. Of this sum Mr. RANTOUL's District received $66,356, or near one-quarter of the entire amount.

We have no comments to make upon the fact here stated, just now, but suggest the topic for Mr. RANTOUL's consideration in his next free trade disquisition. If his recent demonstration does not provoke an opportunity for him to give his views and his vote on the subject in question, we shall be disappointed.

We have no fault to find with Mr. RANTOUL for arguing in favor of the infant railroad corporations in the West, and for grants to them, that, in many cases, will no doubt raise them to the stature of full grown giant monopolies, such as this country has never yet seen. For Mr. RANTOUL is a lawyer, and this is in the way of his business. Such monopolies are doubtless very *democratic*. Cotton corporations, however, in Massachusetts, where men club together and put in their own money, are, in the eye of Mr. RANTOUL and his political friends, *aristocratic* monopolies. But railroad corporations, in Michigan and elsewhere, that receive immense donations of the public domain to enrich the proprietors, and create a class of princely land-holders of sufficient power to sway the destinies of a State, and perchance to fix the policy of a nation, we take it for granted, are especially democratic; at least in the view of the member of the great fishing district of Massachusetts.

Mr. RANTOUL argues that it is for the interest of the Western States to pay five and twenty millions of dollars per annum to transport their surplus food to the seaboard over the railroads, (we presume Mr. R. is no stockholder in, nor Attorney for, any of these Corporations, of which he advocates the making and the endowing by enormous grants of land,) and the ferrying over the Atlantic of the same at a cost of half or two-thirds as much more, in order to find a *foreign* market, instead of pursuing a course of national policy that would enable the holders of this surplus to sell it *at home* and save the expense of transportation entirely. We take it, that it requires no great effort to prove this. It is all in the way of trade, and if it were not done the railroads would be out of business, (and solicitors of railroads would not be needed,) and the bounty paid crews of Gloucester and Marblehead would not be wanted to navigate the ships of Massachusetts Bay.

We do not know what the free traders would do were it not for the *famine* years that we have had under the 1846 Tariff. By making use of them, and stealing one-half of the fiscal year, 1847, that belonged to the Tariff of 1842, which they invariably do, they can make out a most formidable array of calculations. By this process, Mr. RANTOUL, undertakes to show that President FILLMORE's statement, that under the Tariff of 1846, agricultural products have not risen in price, is unfounded, and he figures it out that flour has been worth 80c. more ℔ bbl. under the 1846 than under the 1842 Tariff, and wheat in proportion. Taking the five years of the 1846 Tariff and the four years of the 1842 Tariff *together*, and this may be true. But taking out the *famine years* how is it? Why just as the President asserts, and Mr. RANTOUL knows it.

Mr. RANTOUL may call this a fair way of arguing. We have no milder name for it than cheating. If Mr. RANTOUL can show that the Tariff of 1846 has had a favorable operation upon the prices of agricultural products, so can it be shown by the same process that the Tariff of 1828 (the highest Tariff we ever had) worked admirably. The prices of Flour during the five years of its continuance averaged nearly *a dollar a barrel* more than the prices under the preceding Tariff of 1824. But who does not know that all conclusions drawn from such calculations as these are gross delusions? The short crop of 1830-31 in Europe enhanced prices. The famine of 1846-47 did the same. What sense is there in imputing to either Tariff these results, considering the circumstances under which they occurred? And as it is in regard to prices, so is it in regard to the *amount* of exports. The export of our breadstuffs and provisions will always be measured, not by our high or low Tariffs, but by the wants of Europe arising from their own short crops. Thus the average of our exports of flour under the high Tariff of 1828 was about 1,200,000 bbls. annually. Under the Tariff of 1824 it was but 800,000 bbls., and under the Compromise Tariff of 1833 it was scarcely half a million of barrels. This would plainly show, arguing *a la* RANTOUL, that a high Tariff promotes exports of breadstuffs, and a low Tariff operates the reverse. But the fact is, it shows nothing about it, one way or the other. And all the statistics Mr. RANTOUL has exhibited to show the favorable operation of the Tariff of 1846, in promoting exports, rests upon no better foundation than would a deduction of the kind alluded to. If men argue merely to *make out a case*, we think statistics enough can be found to be pressed into the support of any doctrine, however absurd. In the hands of an ingenious man, no lying can be made greater than the lying of figures.

Another gross delusion connected with the Tariff question, and is intimated by Mr. RANTOUL, is the idea that the property of a country is to be measured, in a considerable degree, by the amount of its imports and exports. Yet they really have little or nothing to do with it. Probably the greatest importing and exporting country on the globe, in proportion to its population, is the island of New-Foundland. With only 80,000 inhabitants, its exports are between four and five millions of dollars per annum, and its imports the same. Commercially, this is a great show, and sounds wonderfully well for its prosperity. But it is, nevertheless, a lean, unthrifty, half-starved country. On the other hand, Prince Edward's Island, possessing not far from the same population, and in close proximity to it, is one of the most thrifty, well to do, and prosperous communities on the Continent. Yet its exports and imports are scarcely nothing. They do not exceed much, if any, a hundred thousand dollars a year. These are small countries, to be sure, but they answer for illustrations, as well as if they were larger. It is not imports and exports that make a country prosperous. It is a diversified production.

But one of the coolest things said by Mr. RANTOUL, is his declaration that the sending of our California gold out of the coutry is all that saves us from innumerable disasters. If we kept the gold, he says, we should have entailed upon us the "greatest of calamities." "It would," says he, "throw all our business relations into a state of perfect anarchy." If we retained the half of it, of course we should be half as badly off as he describes. If we should keep but a quarter of our annual supply, our case would be better, but still we should suffer wretchedly; but by exporting it *all*, we come out safe and sound out of the devilish clutches of the gold diggers, and get on most gloriously. Well, this is a novel view, and we are rejoiced to find we have one man in the country who possesses sagacity enough to point out and measure the mischief of having too much money, and to teach us to glorify over our lucky escape from immeasurable evils, by having it sent out of the country as fast as it comes in. This is to be set down to the credit of the Tariff of 1846, of course. This not only opens the gate to let in all foreign commodities, but it opens it to let out all our pestilent money, which Mr. RANTOUL evidently considers to be "the root of all evil."

Alas! The world has been awfully deluded. The impression has strangely prevailed that a full supply of the hard, solid cash was a good thing. Men go [illegible] to get it, and the individual man who is successful and makes his "pile" of the genuine California, is reckoned the fortunate fellow. Gold! Why what is the world after but gold? And is it really no advantage to the individual to have a heap of it? And is not the nation composed of individuals? What is good for the one must be good for the many. Too much money, indeed! Too rich, forsooth!

We do not require to be told that the substantial wealth of a Nation does not lie in its supply of the precious metals. But we are, for the first time, informed that a full metalic circulating medium, the possession of gold in such plentiful quantities that it would "flow up the Mississippi," would be the "greatest of calamaties." It has been left to Mr. RANTOUL to discover that; and he undertakes to show how profound his observation is, by pointing us to Spain, who once thought gold *was* wealth, and legislated accordingly. This may answer for the fishermen of Marblehead and the shoemakers of Lynn, in Mr. RANTOUL's estimation, but we give them credit for the possession of more sense than to be caught by such chaff.

One of Mr. RANTOUL's coadjutors in the Railroad line, Mr. Secretary WALKER, does not think the possession of the "vile dross" would be such a terrific calamity as it is alleged to be by Mr. RANTOUL. He has been down on his marrow bones before the English and Continental capitalists for a year or so, trying to beg some millions of dollars of them to build a great Railroad in Illinois; and if we mistake not Mr. RANTOUL wrote a pamphlet last winter to aid him in his application. Illinois would not consider herself ruined by getting fifteen or twenty millions of this same California gold. And we don't suppose any other State in the Union would refuse a like installment on the ground that it would "throw all their business relations into a state of perfect anarchy," and be to them "the greatest of calamities." Even Mr. RANTOUL cannot be supposed to believe the money would be such a serious damage to Illinois, or he would not have been guilty of aiding and abetting their application for it through their sycophantic agent. And if Illinois can take fifteen millions, not only without detriment, but with positive benefit, why not the rest of the country in the same proportion?

But we have no room or disposition to pursue this question. We have always been verdant enough to suppose that one of the great wants of a new, flourishing, enterprising country, was a full currency; and that while gold is the standard of value, no currency is so good as gold. And we always took it to be a fact, that nothing would so much promote enterprise, stimulate production, diversify industry, build up villages, towns and cities, and infuse life into all the various channels of business, and so develop all the resources of a country, as a sound and ample circulating medium. And hence we have deplored a national policy that sends out of the country the gold of California as fast as it is dug out of the earth; for such a disposition of it presents a national development here such as it has never entered into the imagination of man to conceive. The annual addition of twenty-five or fifty millions of coin to our circulation, for a series of years, coöperating with a sound protective policy, would launch this nation upon a flood tide that would float it to an unequaled and almost incalculable material prosperity. The means to do this are in our hands, but we prodigally fling them away, under the sapient advice of such theorists as Mr. RANTOUL.

Mr. GEYER, the new Whig Senator from Missouri, made a speech to-day on the Iowa Land Bill. He is said to be an able lawyer, and, like all able lawyers, is undoubtedly good at resolving mental nebulæ. But he is not a Benton.

The friends of FILLMORE have been fired within a few days with a holy ambition to advance the interests of their leader. Their hopes have mounted with the Tennessee nomination, and the general aspect of things in the South, to the belief that there is a good chance for the President at the National Convention. If anything like galvanic action should manifest itself in distant official circles, let it be imputed to these refreshed hopes which, we doubt not, glow in the bosom of the apparently tranquil, non-committal New-York gentleman at the head of the Government, with as much fervor as among those whose external manifestations are more marked. Mr. Fillmore is a candidate. J. S. P.

The Census Printing—The Great Banquet—Douglas and his Cabinet.

Correspondence of the N. Y. Tribune.

WASHINGTON, Saturday, Feb. 21, 1852.

The week is ended, and the "rain is descending on the just and the unjust," while a Banquet is prepared at Willard's Hotel, intended to heal all the differences in our Congressional party, and remove all the difficulties in the way of printing the Seventh Census. For some time *The Republic* has led off with a laugh at our divisions in Congress, taunting the Democracy with being unable to carry a single measure through Congress, (meaning the printing of the Seventh Census, about which there is said to exist an amicable, if not a pecuniary and profitable understanding, between *The Republic* and *The Union*.) This is followed up daily by *The Union*, in such editorials and extracts from *The Republic* as will produce the best possible effect on the Democratic members of Congress, touching the said printing. To one ignorant of the "wheel within a wheel" of these two old organs, antagonistic in principle, but amicably harmonizing on printing and plunder, it would be difficult to account for such counter-currents and evident extremes meeting. When, however, the immense profits are realized of printing the Seventh Census, and when all the side arrangements between *The Union* and *The Republic* are seen, the thing is as plain as Father RITCHIE's claim. *The Union* has also been engaged zealously in getting CASS out of the KOSSUTH Intervention, even pulling him out, and going so far as to say, that, in all his speecees and resolutions, he didn't mean anything! This bait for the CASS members became necessary from the neutrality of *The Union* being somewhat suspected or endangered, through the over-zealous labors of the senior editor of *The Union*, and his son-in-law ARNOLD HARRIS, of New Orleans, in behalf of the Young Giant of the West. Openly, and on the surface, the editors of the old organ are the most neutral and disinterested editors extant; but beneath, there has been running a swift but silent current, carrying all before it, for Judge DOUGLAS. This current has been running since last September's equinox, all one way, and "the wayfaring man, though a fool," would soon find it out, especially in Washington, where old men and women can never keep a secret after sundown.

The banqueting at WILLARD's has brought back General HOUSTON to participate in its exhilarating and *enlivening* scenes and festivities, and although he is not to be the beneficiary of its effects or results—giving the public printing to *The Union*—still he was there, in strange contrast with the Young Giant, the wine-bibbers and blood-suckers. The *on dit* of the evening is that Judge DOUGLAS has selected his Cabinet, and I give it to you, as it came forth at the banqueting hall at WILLARD's:

General HIRAM WALBRIDGE, of Ohio, Secretary of State.
GEO. N. SANDERS, of Kentucky, Secretary of the Treasury.
J. KNOX WALKER, of Tennessee, Secretary of the Interior.
THOS. L. CLINGMAN, of N. Carolina, Secretary of War.
EDWIN CROSWELL, of New-York, Secretary of the Navy.
LEWIS C. LEVIN, of Pennsylvania, Attorney General.
Judge RICHARD M. YOUNG, of Illinois, Postmaster-General.

This will be a strong Cabinet, and will grow stronger, as well as the Young Giant, before the election takes place. The race between Gen. SCOTT and the Young Giant will be a short one. Messrs. FILLMORE and WEBSTER are working at cross purposes, and the probabilities are that they will both be distanced. EXETER.

The Yeas and Nays in the House on the Bounty Land Warrants.

Yeas and Nays on agreeing to the fifth section of the bill explanatory of the Bounty Land Law of September, 1850, which section grants 160 acres of land to every officer and soldier, whether of regulars, militia or volunteers, who may have been actually engaged in any action or encounter with the enemy, in any of the wars specified in the September act, without regard to length of service, &c.

YEAS—Messrs. W. Appleton, Babcock Bailey, Bayly, Barrere, Bartlett, Jr., Bennett, Bowie, Boyd, Breckenridge, Brenton, Briggs, Brooks, Busby, Cable, Caldwell, L. D. Campbell, Thompson Campbell, Cartter, Caskie, Churchwell, J. G. Davis, Dawson, Duncan, Dunham, Edmundson, Evans, Ewing, Fitch, Florence, H. M. Fuller, Gamble, Gentry, Gilmore, Grey, Hall, Hamilton, Hammond, Harper, Hart, Haws, Hebard, Hendricks, Hibbard, Howard, How, Jr., A. Johnson, J. Johnson, J. G. Jones, G. G. King, Kuhns, Kurtz, Landry, Lockhart, Mason, McLanahan, McMullen, McNair, Meacham, Miller, Molony, H. D. Moore, J. Moore, Morrison, Nabers, Olds, A. Parker, S. W. Parker, Peaslee, Phelps, Polk, Porter, Powell, Richardson, Robbins, Jr., Robinson, Sackett, Savage, Schermerhorn, Scurry, Smith, Snow, Stanly, B. Stanton, R. H. Stanton, A. P. Stevens, Th. Stevens, St. Martin, Stratton, Taylor, Benj. Thompson, G. W. Thompson, Townshend, Walbridge, Walsh, Welch, Addison White, Yates—98.

NAYS—Messrs. Abercrombie, Allison, J. Appleton, Ashe, Averett, Beale, Bell, Albert G. Brown, Burrows, Chandler, Chapman, Chastain, Clark, Cleveland, Clingman, Cobb, Conger, Curtis, Daniel, Dockery, Doty, Durkee, Eastman, Edgerton, Fowler, Freeman, T. J. D. Fuller, Gaylord, Giddings, Goodenow, Grow, S. W. Harris, Hascall, Haven, Henn, Horsford, Houston, J. W. Howe, Hunter, Ingersoll, Ives, Jackson, Jenkins, James Johnson, D. T. Jones, G. W. Jones, Letcher, H. Marshall, Meade, Morehead, Murphy, Newton, Orr, Outlaw, Penniman, Perkins, Riddle, Schoolcraft, Schoonmaker, D. L. Seymour, O. S. Seymour, Skelton, Smart, Strother, Stuart, Thurston, Toombs, Wallace, Ward, Watkins, Wells, Wilcox, Wildrick, Williams—74.

ABSENT OR NOT VOTING—Messrs. Aiken, Chas. Allen, Willis Allen, Andrews, Bibighaus, Bissell, Bocock, Bowne, Bragg, G. H. Brown, Buell, Burt, Cabell, Colcock, Cottman, Cullom, Darby, George T. Davis, Dean, Dimmick, Disney, Faulkner, Ficklin, Floyd, Goodrich, Gorman, Green, Isham G. Harris, Hillyer, Holladay, T. M. Howe, R. W. Johnson, Pr. King, Mace, Mann, E. C. Marshall, Martin, McCorkle, McDonald, McQueen, Millson, Miner, Murray, Penn, Price, Rantoul, Jr., Robie, Ross, Russell, Scudder, F. P. Stanton, Alex. H. Stephens, Stone, Sutherland, Sweetser, Tuck, Venable, Washburn, Jr., Alex. White, Woodward—61.

Yeas and Nays on ordering to be engrossed for a third reading the bill explanatory of the Bounty Land Law of Sept 28, 1850, as published in *The Tribune* on the 27th inst.

YEAS—Messrs. Abercrombie, W. Allen, Allison, J. Appleton, Babcock, Bailey, Bayly, Barrere, Bell, Bennett, Bowie, Breckenridge, Brenton, A. G. Brown, Busby, Cabell, Caldwell, T. Campbell, Chandler, Chastain, Churchwell, Clingman, Cobb, Cottman, J. G. Davis, Dawson, Duncan, Dunham, Edgerton, Edmundson, Ewing, Ficklin, Fitch, Florence, Freeman, H. M. Fuller, Gamble, Gaylord, Gentry, Gilmore, Hamilton, Hammond, S. W. Harris, Hebard, Hendricks, Houston, How, Jr., A. Johnson, James Johnson, John Johnson, R. W. Johnson, D. T. Jones, Kurtz, Landry, Lockhart, H. Marshall, Mason, McLanahan, McMullen, McNair, Meacham, Miller, Molony, J. Moore, Morrison, Murphy, Nabers, Olds, A. Parker, S. W. Parker, Penn, Polk, Powell, Richardson, Robbins, Jr., Robinson, Savage, Smart, Snow, R. H. Stanton, Abraham P. Stevens, Stone, St. Martin, Stratton, Strother, Taylor, Walsh, Ward, Washburn, Jr., Watkins, Welch, Addison White, Alex. White, Wilcox, Williams, Yates—96.

NAYS—Messrs. W. Appleton, Ashe, Averett, Bartlett, Beale, Boyd, Bragg, Briggs, Brooks, Burrows, L. D. Campbell, Cartter, Caskie, Chapman, Clark, Cleveland, Conger, Curtis, Daniel, George T. Davis, Dockery, Doty, Durkee, Eastman, Evans, Fowler, T. J. D. Fuller, Goodenow, Grow, Hall, Harper, Hart, Haws, Hascall, Haven, Henn, Hibbard, Horsford, Howard, J. W. Howe, Hunter, Ingersoll, Jackson, Jenkins, G. W. Jones, J. Glancy Jones, Kuhns, Letcher, Meade, H. D. Moore, Morehead, Newton, Orr, Outlaw, Peaslee, Penniman, Perkins, Phelps, Robie, Sackett, Schermerhorn, Schoolcraft, Schoonmaker, Scurry, D. L. Seymour, O. S. Seymour, Skelton, Smith, B. Stanton, T. Stevens, Stuart, Sutherland, B. Thompson, Geo. W. Thompson, Thurston, Toombs, Townshend, Venable, Walbridge, Wallace, Wells, Wildrick, Woodward—83.

ABSENT OR NOT VOTING—Messrs. Aiken, C. Allen, Andrews, Bibighaus, Bissell, Bocock, Bowne, G. H. Brown, Buell, Burt, Cable, Colcock, Cullom, Darby, Dean, Dimmick, Disney, Faulkner, Floyd, Giddings, Goodrich, Gorman, Green, Grey, I. G. Harris, Hillyer, Holladay, T. M. Howe, Ives, G. G. King, P. King, Mace, Mann, E. C. Marshall, Martin, McCorkle, McDonald, McQueen, Millson, Miner, Murray, Porter, Price, Rantoul, Jr., Riddle, Ross, Russell, Scudder, Stanly, F. P. Stanton, A. H. Stephens, Sweetser, Tuck, Venable—54.

CANADA.

Quebec and Halifax Railroad—Revised Statutes—Bureau of Agriculture—Railways—Commerce of Quebec.

Correspondence of The N. Y. Tribune.

TORONTO, Saturday, Feb. 21, 1852.

The publication of dispatches from Earl Grey, on the subject of the Quebec and Halifax Railroad, has given rise to new speculations as to the possible success of that scheme. It is now apparent to every one that the Imperial Government desire to see these Provinces connected with a Railroad for military purposes; and that to any enterprise that will not forward these views, they will give no encouragement. Mr. Howe, the delegate from Nova Scotia to England, came back with a mistaken view of the intentions of the Imperial Government; assuring the delighted denizens of New-Brunswick that the imperial guarantee would be extended to the capital necessary to construct a line from the Province to Portland. Lieut. Governor, Sir John Harvey, in his speech to the Nova-Scotia Legislature, repeated the delusion of Mr. Howe. That speech caught the eye of Earl Grey, the Colonial Secretary, who at once writes a dispatch, to correct the mistaken idea on which such false hopes had been built. The principle is broadly laid down, that no assistance will be given by the Home Government to any enterprise in the Colonies, unless it be calculated to promote some important interests of the Empire at large, and not merely of the individual colony. The adoption of this principle shows that the ideas of the Cobden school of economists that the Colonies should not be abandoned, have gained no ascendency over the Imperial Cabinet, and a military railroad of from seven to twelve hundred miles to connect these Provinces, is in pretty direct contrast to the menace of withdrawing the troops. It is quite probable that that threat was a mere *ruse* intended to serve an ulterior purpose. However this may be, and even if the greater part of the troops were withdrawn, a military railroad would still be of material use in the event of a protracted war with the United States. And what does the Home Government risk, pecuniarily, in its proposal to guarantee the necessary capital at 3½ per cent—$35,000,000—to construct the work? Aside from the possible contingency of after repudiation, there is literally no risk whatever. Plenty of capitalists will be willing to advance the money on the terms proposed; and there is no doubt, unless some unforseen contingency occur, that the Provinces would be prompt in the payment of the interest. The Chancellor of the Imperial Exchequer would never have to take this transaction into his calculations at all. And what in return would England gain? The means of transporting, in time of war, her troops with all the rapidity that modern science can obtain from one end to the other of these extensive possessions. True, the advantage is solely military; but that England is willing to incur the responsibility of seven millions sterling is proof that her statesmen think it advisable to be prepared for the possible contingency of war. That contingency can only contemplate civil war, or war with the United States. In the latter event, the retention of these Provinces, except Quebec, would not much help her—indeed it would be a manifest disadvantage, because against that territory the enemy would direct its force. But in the case of revolt the advantages to England of such a military railroad would be more obvious. And this, it seems reasonable to conclude, is the real reason that makes the British Government anxious to see that enterprise carried into effect. It must be confessed, however, that the success of the work has been rendered very equivocal by this *ultimatum* of the Imperial Government. So long as there was a chance that assistance would be extended to New-Brunswick to build their favorite line to Portland, there were hopes that on this condition they might assent to become a party to the construction of the Halifax and Quebec line; but now that this delightful piece of log-rolling, in which Mr. Howe had such great faith, is prevented, it is probable that New-Brunswick will bend all her energies to establish the Portland line, partly from a conviction of self interest, and partly in amiable revenge for the disappointment she has met. It is now proposed to run the line in a direction which it is believed will be agreeable to New-Brunswick; that is, to follow Major Robinson's line from Point Levi to River du Loup, or Trois Pistoles, crossing to Lake Temiscouta, and from thence traversing in its main course a country watered by the tributaries of the St. John to the City of St. John. A conference has just been held at Halifax, Nova Scotia, between three members of the Canadian Government and one member of the Executive of New-Brunswick, at which this line obtained the preference. The Executive Council of Nova Scotia refuse to sanction this line, and still bear one-third of the cost of constructing the work. They also express an opinion that if brought before the Parliament of that Province the proposition would be rejected. The Canadian Government offers as its *ultimatum* that Canada shall bear one-third of the expense of constructing the line, Nova Scotia one-fourth and New-Brunswick five-twelfths. How Nova Scotia will receive this proposition remains to be seen; but, looking at the whole matter, I am unable to see any prospect of agreement between the three Provinces likely to lead to success. In fact, the Canadian Government has begun to look to the possibility of the work being constructed by a private company, aided by the Provincial Legislatures to the extent of $400,000 a year for twenty years. At this moment the whole business is involved in the utmost doubt and perplexity.

A commission is shortly to be appointed to revise the statutes; but I am not aware that it is intended to alter the system of legal procedure. Being a subject of a kindred nature, I may remark that people here cannot understand how it is that the trial of important cases in the State of New-York, occupies such a length of time, as, for instance, did the Forrest divorce case. We generally get through the most important case here in a day; and I never knew a trial to occupy two days. Why this vast difference?

Malcolm Cameron has accepted the newly created Bureau of Agriculture in connection with the Presidency of the Executive Council.

The assumption by the Government of the liabilities of the Atlantic and St. Lawrence Railway Company, has recently been the subject of some animadversion by portion of the Provincial press. The Company was on the verge of insolvency last summer, when the Directors deputed Mr. Youngs, the Vice President, to come to Toronto and induce the Government so persuade the Legislature to sanction an issue of Government debentures in place of the debentures of the Company. For this service Mr. Youngs was to receive one per cent. on the amount. He succeeded, and by the transaction netted some $20,000. Many people think he made his money too easy, and complain that he got the means of corrupting corruptible men with a view of carrying his purpose.

The Great Western Railroad Company may be regarded as being very much under American control. At the suggestions of Americans who have taken stock in the Company, they have stipulated to adopt the narrow guage; while the main trunk line is to have a guage of five feet six inches. Re-loading will therefore be necessary at Hamilton, a circumstance that cannot fail to give the Toronto and Guelp line a great advantage over the Great Western.

At Quebec, our great seaport, there arrived, in 1851, 117 vessels, with an aggregate tunnage of 41,655 tuns. They belonged to the following countres:

	Vessels.	Tuns.		Vessels.	Tuns.
Norway	47	39,364	Hanover	1	212
Russia	8	3,668	Mecklenburg	2	478
Prussia	21	7,667	United States	35	20,062
Sweden	3	989			

Sixty-eight new vessels, with an aggregate tunnage of 41,655 tuns, were registered in Quebec last year. L. C.

KOSSUTH IN OHIO.

KOSSUTH'S SPEECHES AT CINCINNATI.

The great Hungarian received several deputations in Cincinnati on the 18th and 19th inst. Among others a large deputation from the Jewish Charitable Fraternity waited on him, and presented an address accompanied by a little substantial aid. Kossuth replied to the address as follows:

GENTLEMEN: I humbly and cordially thank you for your kind sympathy, and for your material aid. Religious conviction is a matter which every man must settle between his own conscience and his God—a matter in which human power should never interfere; but human power and political institutions should afford a fair field to truth, that every man might be free to look to the important cause of his salvation, in the free employment of private judgment and with the light of intelligence. [Applause.] You are the remnants of a nation oppressed in the greater portion of the world throughout centuries, and you still exist. Let humanity, let this great Republic, take this as a demonstration of the truth, that oppression never can entirely crush the existence of a nation, and never can it crush religious conviction. There is a sentiment in the heart of man, which, when oppressed for the sake of principles, clings more closely in misfortune to those principles. This is a revelation of the dignity of the human mind. I have often heard a doubt about the success of that cause I have pleaded, not relying on any public authority. I have no document of a diplomatic mission. I have my mission drawn from out of those duties which give to every honest man a mission to be faithful to the cause of humanity, and to every patriot to act and do all his life everything he can, according to his feeble abilities, for the benefit of his country. But I was about to say there exists a doubt of success of the cause. Now let those who entertain such a doubt look to their own history. If Washington and the generation who lived when he led the people of the United States to freedom and independence had doubted about the success of their struggles, what would America be now? Instead of the glorious principles of civil and religious liberty being embodied in a mighty nation, America would be a vegetating colony, dependent on a foreign power. There is a faith which secures bliss in heaven, and progress here on earth. He who despairs of a cause, or has not the intention to benefit it, had best not to be engaged in it. Faith is required to the trial of a cause which is just, but besides this, let those who doubt look to the remnants of your nation—oppressed through centuries, yet still existing, and it has existed until it has found a home in the new world, where religious conviction is no obstacle to you to be free as men and as citizens. In Hungary we have not been so long oppressed but that we had proved three years ago that we had not only the will, but also the necessary strength and power to be independent; and all circumstances taken as they are, I believe that no man in calm judgment can disavow my statement that now, in the present position of affairs, Hungary, and all the oppressed nations of Europe, are at least in a condition fifty per cent. better than in 1848. You judge it necessary to apologise, as it were, that you, a corporation of a charitable description, should give your aid to measures which might lead to war. Permit me, Sir, to make in that respect a few remarks, or rather a distinction. I believe great questions depend on the good understanding of a word and the surrounding circumstances. Your aid, and all the aid which the people of the United States bestow on the cause I plead will not lead to a war, but will make an end of an existing war. Is there peace in Europe? What is peace? It is the tranquillity of nations and of men, secured, in the enjoyment of their rights, and living under the protection of the laws. That is what I call peace. If I employ my force against an individual and crush him down, is that a condition of peace between us? It is not; it is a condition of oppression. And what is he doing who oppresses? He is prosecuting a war; because a war is nothing but the employment of brutal force to oppress men or nations. Therefore I say, in aiding my nation, and the other nations of Europe who are equally oppressed, you will not lead us to make a war. You will help us to put an end to that war which despots are waging, and will go on, so long as nations cannot restore the rule of law and the rule of right. I attach great importance to this consideration, that if the oppressed nations of Europe are not aided to secure their rights and to restore tranquility and peace, you will encourage a war, because despots are thereby encouraged to trample down nation after nation. Now, almost throughout the whole of Europe, there is but a single nation, of a kindred race to the people of the United States, which enjoys a real constitutional government; for though not republican, many of the institutions of England are kindred to yours—and now we hear almost by every mail, of a disposition already to invade those institutions by that spirit of absolutism, since the usurpation of Louis Napoleon. So goes on that war of despotism, and so it will continue to go on while liberal institutions remain, dangerous to its own existence. Even in respect to the effusion of blood, the present condition of affairs is more cruel than a war in which nations are engaged. Take Russia for instance. Russia is in a condition of peace, if you please—where there is on one side a master, and on the other sixty millions of oppressed people depending on his arbitrary power. Nobody works for himself, every body for a master. The effect of this condition is, that every man is employing his time to furnish the necessary means to the ambition, the luxury, of a master just one degree above himself. The people are in such a condition, that the average age of human life is only eighteen years—that is taking the population and the mortality for a century. Yet Russia, for the greatest part, is a country far more healthy than the United States; because here nature is not yet quite developed, and the extirpation of ancient forests for the first thirty or forty years brings with it certain diseases in the territory of the United States which are not a natural condition of your climate, but that incidental effect of the new civilization of those countries which will by and by disappear. Still in the United States the average age is thirty-five years—and looking at the disproportion you will see the terrible condition of the people in Russia, where the destruction of human life is more terrible and more sanguinary than any battle recorded in history. Therefore, I may give your charitable association the assurance, that by bestowing your aid to the cause I plead, you do not promote war, but you help to put an end to a war, which is exterminating nations, destroying millions and millions who would be spared, if the war of despotism should cease. Let me advert to another circumstance which may be gratifying to you. You do not appear in this act other than as citizens of America; and I hope the great harmony, the national harmony which unites her inhabitants of different nations, speaking different tongues, will always unite them in the great principle of common freedom—all loving this country for the security it affords them in the enjoyment of civil and religious liberty. I know, however, that blood is blood, and that there is a tie of the community of religion, or of descent, though the race may be scattered in different parts of the world, and therefore that though you are here in the happy condition that your religion is no obstacle to you to be free as other citizens of the United States, you must feel a sympathy toward those of your brethren in Europe who are not in this happy condition, but deprived of many social and civil rights, and having their religion unprotected by the laws. And it will, therefore, be gratifying to you to learn that I consider it my duty of honor everywhere to state that, in our past struggles in Hungary, no part of the people proved itself more warmly devoted to the cause of the independence for which we struggled than the Jewish population of Hungary; we found among them devoted, disinterested men, who offered their services, sacrificed their fortunes, and, by their skill, rendered much service to the cause. They were among those who, in the general oppression, had to feel the weight of those institutions which debar your persuasion in Europe from the enjoyment of civil and religious rights, and who were pushed into the direction, the only one open to them, by which, if they could not become free, they should at least become rich. And that is precisely the reason they are now persecuted, because Austria wants money, and where it finds money it takes it.—[Laughter.] Now, too, the landed property of Catholic monasteries is being mortgaged to obtain a new loan to oppress nations. Every source is drying out, and there is no help more. I mention this as a proof that where it finds money it takes it, [renewed laughter] and the pretext is for the oppression of your brethren, who were faithful to those principles for which we fought, and in which we had so far triumphed that, were it not for the interference of Russia, we should now stand an honored and respected member of the great family of independent nations of earth. [Loud applause followed the conclusion of the remarks of Kossuth.]

Mr. Ezekiel informed the Magyar that it was not as a religious denomination they approached him, but as citizens of the United States; and, as members of a charitable association, it was their desire to present him with their small mite.

KOSSUTH was then handed a check for $100.

The ladies composing the Ladies' Cincinnati Hungarian Association, numbering 1,400 or 1,500, presented the Governor with *$800 in cash*, and Mrs. Henry Telfair made a brief address on behalf of the Association. She said that the members of the Association sympathized with the cause of Hungary, and were willing to labor in its behalf. As an evidence of it she presented him with a check for $800. She desired information from him as to the course the Association should hereafter pursue, and in conclusion wished him long life, health, and a *free* home in his native land.

Gov. KOSSUTH then addressed the ladies as follows, during the delivery of which he was frequently applauded:

While I receive with sincere gratitude, the material aid which your tender hearts tender me, to relieve my down-trodden fatherland, allow me to state that I feel particularly obliged for the delicate manner in which you were pleased to tender it, as also for this highly interesting opportunity of expressing to the Cincinnati Ladies' Association of Friends of Hungary my warm thanks face to face, and not only through a delegation.

Because, bowing with deep respect before this blooming circle, I cannot forbear to believe that it is more than a delegation which I have the honor to address, and thus receiving this pledge of your sympathy for poor Hungary, I have full reason to believe that there is an additional benefit in the very manner of this pledge. You know, Ladies, that the proud Sovereigns of the earth wearing crowns, which, by-and-by, had become a mark of oppression and not of dignity, (you know that the crowned Sovereigns are not very fond of republics, or any community of social habits, with common humanity,) that their very wedding-days are celebrated "per procural" by delegation.

Here, the *people* are sovereign, and you, ladies, are the sovereigns of the sovereign. And still you come, in person, to betroth publicly your sympathy to the sacred cause of Liberty. I pledge the honor of my bleeding nation, whom you thus honor and bless, that it will never give you any motive to divorce.

Ladies, I am often told that in this happy country the ladies rule: it is the lot of beauty to be flattered too much—ladies so high minded as you prove to be, cannot take flattery; it must be rather a bore to them—dull business, indeed, I know. I hope, therefore, to be excused for not flattering you. I honor you too much to flatter you.

Allow me, therefore, to say that indeed I don't know if it be really true that in America the ladies rule. I rather feel inclined to doubt about it, precisely because I heard it so often avowed by the gentlemen of America. I have the experience that precisely these men let themselves be the least ruled by the ladies who speak the most about being ruled; and those are the most ruled who give themselves the ridiculous air of petty domestic tyrants before the world. But however this may be, so much *I know*, that every just cause must thrive to which you bestow your tender care; there is the blessing power of love in everything which you do, and love is the almighty principle of all vitality in heaven and on earth; it is love by which the Almighty himself rules the boundless universe.

Man does many things by calculation, or with indifference; the tender heart of woman nothing but love: in your tears and your smiles, in your *sorrows*, and in your joys, there is always love; and herein lies the magic of your omnipotence: it is like the warming rays of the sun. There is a hill of ice—winter has heaped it up, as if it were saying, "Sun, I defy thee; upon my icy breast thy power will break, and thy very rays will freeze." What does the sun? It continues to shine—noiseless it shines on, and shines on, and the ice hill melts away by drops.

Oh! let the sun of your love shine upon the ice-hill of that policy that believes itself to be wise because it is cold. Believe me, ladies, the love of your tender hearts bestowed upon oppressed nations, is more wise than all the supposed wisdom of cold policy.

It is more wise, because it is my intense conviction that even the future of your *own* country will be far better proved by not letting despotism prevail over the earth, than by that *neutrality* by which you yourself grant the privilege to despotism to grow so strong as to be able to govern your own country's future.

And besides, if the United States allow the law of nations to be torn to pieces by ambitious men, is that neutrality? No; it is not neutrality. Every man agrees that the law of nations is a field common to humanity; to preserve this field from the invasion of crowned tyrants, every nation is equally interested.

Now I ask, if the United States abandon this common field to the invasion of Russia, has she remained neutral? No, it is not a neutral act; it is a charter given to the Czar to oppress the world. It is as if you would say, "We could guard the law of nations, which indeed is for our interest to guard, but we won't; but would hereby make known to your supreme majesty, that if it be your sovereign will to trample upon all those laws, and crush down nations, and extinguish the light of nations upon earth, your majesty can do it without any fear—we will not oppose, we will not even protest; only be pleased not to send your Cossacks to our own beloved country—about the rest we don't care." Is